

determination. Therefore, dismissal of the application was issued.

TA-W-31,527; M&M/Mars,
Incorporated, Burr Ridge, Illinois
(March 12, 1996)

Signed at Washington, DC this 12th day of March, 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

*Acting Program Manager, Policy &
Reemployment Services, Office of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 96-7124 Filed 3-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-31,359 Milwaukie, Oregon and TA-W-31,359A Portland, Oregon]

Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc.; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 USC 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on September 13, 1995, applicable to workers at Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc., Milwaukie, Oregon, engaged in employment related to the production of women's blouses. The certification was amended on October 25, 1995 to expand coverage to all workers of the subject firm. The amended notice was published in the Federal Register on November 7, 1995 (60 FR 56174).

At the request of the union, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. New findings show that worker separations have occurred at the subject firm's production facility in Portland, Oregon. The workers produce a variety of men's and women's apparel, including ladies' blazers and men's jackets. The articles manufactured by the subject firm have been impacted importantly by the high import penetration ratio of these articles in the domestic market place.

The ratio of U.S. imports to domestic shipments of women's, girl's, men's and boys' coats and jackets was over 200 percent in 1993, 1994 and 1995.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Pendleton Woolen Mills adversely affected by imports of apparel. Accordingly, the Department is amending the certification to cover the workers of the subject firm in Portland, Oregon.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-31,359 is hereby issued as follows:

"All workers of Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc., Milwaukie, Oregon (TA-W-31,359) and Portland, Oregon (TA-W-

31,359A) who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after August 9, 1994 are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974."

Signed at Washington, D.C. this 13th day of March 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

*Acting Program manager, Policy and
Reemployment Services, Office of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 96-7121 Filed 3-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-31,368 Roxanne of New Jersey; Neptune, New Jersey and TA-W-31,369 Artsan Corporation; Neptune, New Jersey]

Investigations Regarding Certifications of Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance; Correction

This notice corrects the notice for petition numbers TA-W-31,368 and TA-W-31,369 which was published in the Federal Register on September 11, 1995 (60 FR 47185) in FR Document 95-22481.

This revises the subject firm name (petitioners) on the first and second lines in the appendix table on page 47185. On the first line in the second column, the subject firm (petitioners) should read Roxanne of New Jersey (UNITE). On the second line, in the second column, the subject firm (petitioners) should read Art San Corporation (UNITE); in the fourth column, date of petition should read 8/17/95; and in the fifth column product(s) should read Women's Swimwear.

Signed in Washington, D.C., this 13th day of March 1996.

Russell T. Kile,

*Acting Program Manager, Policy and
Reemployment Services, Office of Trade
Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. 96-7122 Filed 3-22-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-M

[TA-W-31,537]

The SERO Company, Inc. Cordele, Georgia; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By an application dated February 9, 1996, former workers of the subject firm requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding worker eligibility to apply for trade adjustment assistance. The denial notice was signed on January 24, 1996 and published in the Federal Register on February 6, 1996 (61 FR 4486).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) if it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) if in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The former workers of The Sero Company Inc. requesting reconsideration claim that the major customer of the subject firm has given its contract to an overseas manufacturing company. Also, petitioners claim Sero expanded its company in the Dominican Republic because it was more economical for them to produce there. Additionally, the petitioners claim that workers were also producing men's sport shirts.

Findings of the investigation show that workers of the subject firm performed contract sewing work on men's dress shirts. Sero now cuts a reduced level of its own dress shirts in Cordele but sewing work is contracted out to another domestic firm.

Company officials report an insignificant amount of production of men's sports shirts in 1995 at Cordele. All production of that product has been transferred to an affiliated plant in the Dominican Republic. Since the predominant portion of the sewing operations encompassed men's dress shirts, the shift in production of men's sports shirts to a foreign facility would not form the basis for worker certification.

Finding show that the contract sewing work at the Cordele plant, was for a single customer. The Department surveyed the customer regarding its contract work and imports of men's dress shirts. The customer reported that foreign contract work declined in 1995 compared with 1994 and finished shirts were not imported. The customer reports that contract sewing work previously performed by Sero was awarded to another domestic facility.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of